

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted along with a request for a one month extension and appropriate fee in reply to the Office Action dated March 21, 2006. Claims 1-6 and 8-35 currently stand rejected. Independent claims 1, 23 and 27 have been amended to more particularly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Support for such amendment may be found at least at pages 12 and 15 of the application as filed. Newly added claims 36-38 have been added to further define patentable aspects of the invention. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In light of the amendment and the remarks presented below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-6 and 8-35 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Blumenthal (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0069792).

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, automatically inserting transaction information into a data field of an information entity and transmitting the information entity with the automatically inserted transaction information from the user equipment. In other words, an information entity has transaction information automatically inserted and is then sent from a user equipment. For example, a user operating a mobile terminal may have information regarding a purchase automatically inserted into a form required to affect the purchase and then send the form from the mobile terminal in order to execute the purchase. Accordingly, the information entity that is sent from the user equipment according to the claimed invention includes transaction information that was automatically inserted.

Applicants have reviewed Blumenthal and have been unable to find any disclosure meeting the above claimed feature. In this regard, at paragraphs [0030] and [0031] of Blumenthal a digitally signed and/or encrypted confirmation of order and an electronic identity associated with a client are transmitted from a payment terminal device to a payment service equipment. There is no disclosure in the cited passage, or indeed in all of Blumenthal, of an information entity associated with the transaction which includes a data field. Furthermore,

Blumenthal fails to teach or suggest the automatic insertion of transaction information into such a data field. Moreover, Blumenthal then necessarily fails to teach or suggest transmitting the information entity as claimed in independent claim 1. To the contrary, Blumenthal merely discloses that separate pieces of information (the confirmation of order and the electronic identity) are transmitted. Applicants respectfully query that if the confirmation of order is seen as being analogous to the claimed information entity, then where does Blumenthal disclose any data fields within the confirmation of order that have transaction information automatically inserted? Applicants note that paragraphs [0065]-[0067] describe the confirmation of order as including information relating to the order that the client has placed, such as the date, the products and/or services ordered, the total sum owed, etc., however, the cited passage fails to describe such information as being automatically inserted into any fields of the confirmation of order. Accordingly, Blumenthal fails to teach or suggest automatically inserting transaction information into a data field of an information entity and transmitting the information entity with the automatically inserted transaction information from the user equipment as claimed in independent claim 1.

To further illustrate the differences between Blumenthal and the claimed invention, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, that the automatic insertion is performed in response to one of receipt of an information entity associated with the transaction or determining that the information entity has been sent by a trusted party. In this regard, even if it were assumed for the sake of argument that Blumenthal disclosed automatically inserting transaction information into a data field of an information entity and transmitting the information entity with the automatically inserted transaction information from the user equipment (an assumption with which Applicants expressly disagree), Blumenthal still fails to teach or suggest that such automatic insertion is performed in response to one of receipt of an information entity associated with the transaction or determining that the information entity has been sent by a trusted party as claimed in independent claim 1.

It is submitted that independent claims 23 and 27 each contain recitations substantially similar those of independent claim 1 with respect to transmitting the information entity with the automatically inserted transaction information from the user equipment and that the automatic

insertion is performed in response to one of receipt of an information entity associated with the transaction or determining that the information entity has been sent by a trusted party. Thus, independent claims 23 and 27 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 8-22, 24-26 and 28-35 depend either directly or indirectly from corresponding ones of independent claims 1, 23 and 27, and thus include all the recitations of their corresponding independent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 2-6, 8-22, 24-26 and 28-35 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claims 1, 23 and 27.

Accordingly, for all the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-6 and 8-35 are overcome.

Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added new claims 36-38 to more particularly define aspects of the present application. The new claims include no new matter and are fully supported by the specification and the drawings of the present application. Support for new claims 36-38 may be found at least at pages 2 and 11 of the application as filed.

Accordingly, it is believed that the new claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendment and the remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON JULY 19, 2006.
LEGAL02/30014082v1